REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-38 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 13, 23 and 34 being independent. Claims 1-2, 10, 13, 20-23 and 31-34 are amended herein. No claims are canceled or withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 22-25, 27, 29-31, 33-35 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lortz (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,610). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other things, determining whether to authorize the operation as a function of whether the user has been delegated administrative authority to perform the operation with respect to the resource, the administrative authority being independent of whether the user is a member of an administrators group associated with any resource of the server.

Lortz, on the other hand, does not disclose such features. Instead, Lortz discloses an authorization system 10 that includes clients 12a-12n that generate resource requests 32 (_see FIG. 1 and col. 1, line 65 – col. 2, line 9 of Lortz_). Each client, such as 12a, can delegate its own authorization credentials to a second client (_see col. 2, lines 10-14 of Lortz_).

However, one remote client delegating its own authorization credentials to another remote client, as taught by Lortz, is entirely different from a system administrator delegating administrative authority to a user. That is, clients

delegating non-administrative credentials is not the same as the system administrator delegating administrative authority. As a result, Lortz fails to disclose or even suggest delegating administrative authority to a user to perform an operation with respect to a resource hosted on a server, as presently claimed.

In addition, Lortz discloses an Access Control List (ACL) 53a-53n that includes authorization levels 59 (*see FIG. 2 and col. 3, lines 30-35 of Lortz*). Specifically, any authorization determination in Lortz requires looking up the corresponding authorization level 59 in the ACL 53a-53n (*see steps 106 and 108 in FIG. 3 of Lortz*). However, contrary to the delegated administrative authority being independent of whether the user is a member of an administrator group, as presently claimed, Lortz affirmatively requires any authorization determination to consider whether the user is a member of an administrator group. In fact, Lortz specifically states:

> "The authorization level 59 refers to the level of authorization needed to access a resource. In one implementation, the authorization levels can have one of the four following values: (1) Owner, (2) Editor, (3) Reviewer, or (4) None. The Owner level permits complete administrative access to the resource, ... and None, which is default/implicit level denies all access to a resource." (*see col. 3, lines 33-41 of Lortz*)

That is, the ACL mechanism of Lortz (which requires an authorization level) is a determination of whether or not a user is a member of an administrator level or group. As a result, Lortz fails to disclose or even suggest delegating administrative authority that is independent of whether the user is a member of an administrators group.

Therefore, Lortz fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is distinguishable over Lortz.

Dependent claims 2-3, 5, 7-10 and 12 depend from claim 1 and are distinguishable over Lortz by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Independent claim 13 recites, among other things, a delegated role-based scope of authority not requiring the user to be a member of an administrators group associated with any resources of the server.

Lortz, on the other hand, does not disclose such features. As discussed above in support of claim 1, Lortz discloses an ACL 53a-53n that includes authorization levels 59 (*see FIG. 2 and col. 3, lines 30-35 of Lortz*). Specifically, any authorization determination in Lortz requires looking up the corresponding authorization level 59 in the ACL 53a-53n (*see steps 106 and 108 in FIG. 3 of Lortz*). However, contrary to the delegated role-based scope of authority not requiring the user to be a member of an administrator group, as presently claimed, Lortz affirmatively requires any authorization determination to consider whether the user is a member of an administrator group. In fact, Lortz specifically states:

> "The authorization level 59 refers to the level of authorization needed to access a resource. In one implementation, the authorization levels can have one of the four following values: (1) Owner, (2) Editor, (3) Reviewer, or (4) None. The Owner level permits complete administrative access to the resource, ... and None, which is default/implicit level denies all access to a resource." (*see col. 3, lines 33-41 of Lortz*)

That is, the ACL mechanism of Lortz (which requires an authorization level) is a determination of whether or not a user is a member of an administrator level or group. As a result, Lortz fails to disclose or even suggest a delegated role-based scope of authority not requiring the user to be a member of an administrators group.

Therefore, Lortz fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 13. Accordingly, claim 13 is distinguishable over Lortz.

Dependent claims 14, 16, 18-20 and 22 depend from claim 13 and are distinguishable over Lortz by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Independent claim 23 recites, among other things, a delegated role-based scope of authority not requiring the user to be a member of an administrators group associated with any resources of the server.

Lortz, on the other hand, does not disclose such features. As discussed above in support of claim 1, Lortz discloses an ACL 53a-53n that includes authorization levels 59 (*see FIG. 2 and col. 3, lines 30-35 of Lortz*). Specifically, any authorization determination in Lortz requires looking up the corresponding authorization level 59 in the ACL 53a-53n (*see steps 106 and 108 in FIG. 3 of Lortz*). However, contrary to the delegated role-based scope of authority not requiring the user to be a member of an administrator group, as presently claimed, Lortz affirmatively requires any authorization determination to consider whether the user is a member of an administrator group. In fact, Lortz specifically states:

"The authorization level 59 refers to the level of authorization needed to access a resource. In one implementation, the authorization levels can have one of the four following values: (1) Owner, (2) Editor, (3) Reviewer, or (4) None. The Owner level permits complete administrative access to the resource, ... and None, which is default/implicit level denies all access to a resource." (*see col. 3, lines 33-41 of Lortz*)

That is, the ACL mechanism of Lortz (which requires an authorization level) is a determination of whether or not a user is a member of an administrator level or group. As a result, Lortz fails to disclose or even suggest a delegated role-based scope of authority not requiring the user to be a member of an administrators group.

Therefore, Lortz fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 23. Accordingly, claim 23 is distinguishable over Lortz.

Dependent claims 24-25, 27, 29-31 and 33 depend from claim 23 and are distinguishable over Lortz by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Independent claim 34 recites, among other things, a delegated role-based scope of authority not requiring the user to be a member of an administrators group associated with any resources of the server.

Lortz, on the other hand, does not disclose such features. As discussed above in support of claim 1, Lortz discloses an ACL 53a-53n that includes authorization levels 59 (*see FIG. 2 and col. 3, lines 30-35 of Lortz*). Specifically, any authorization determination in Lortz requires looking up the corresponding authorization level 59 in the ACL 53a-53n (*see steps 106 and 108 in FIG. 3 of*

Lortz). However, contrary to the delegated role-based scope of authority not requiring the user to be a member of an administrator group, as presently claimed, Lortz affirmatively requires any authorization determination to consider whether the user is a member of an administrator group. In fact, Lortz specifically states:

> "The authorization level 59 refers to the level of authorization needed to access a resource. In one implementation, the authorization levels can have one of the four following values: (1) Owner, (2) Editor, (3) Reviewer, or (4) None. The Owner level permits complete administrative access to the resource, ... and None, which is default/implicit level denies all access to a resource." (*see col. 3, lines 33-41 of Lortz*)

That is, the ACL mechanism of Lortz (which requires an authorization level) is a determination of whether or not a user is a member of an administrator level or group. As a result, Lortz fails to disclose or even suggest a delegated role-based scope of authority not requiring the user to be a member of an administrators group.

Therefore, Lortz fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 34. Accordingly, claim 34 is distinguishable over Lortz.

Dependent claims 35 and 38 depend from claim 34 and are distinguishable over Lortz by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 6, 11, 15, 17, 21, 26, 28, 32 and 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,610) in view of Krishnan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,856). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Dependent claims 4, 6, 11, 15, 17, 21, 26, 28, 32 and 36-37 are distinguishable over the proposed combination of references by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 1, 13, 23 and 34, as well as for additional features that they recite. In addition, there is no motivation to combine the Lortz and Krishnan references. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. However, if there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

LEE & HAYES, pllc

Dated: _9/12/08_

By: _____

David S. Lee
Reg. No. 38,222
J. Mark Han
Reg. No. 57,898
(206) 315-4001